



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Two Recent Introductions to the Old Testament.

"An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," by S. R. Driver, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. *"Einleitung in das Alte Testament,"* by Carl Heinrich Cornill, Professor of Theology at the University of Königsberg.

I.

ALMOST simultaneously in England and Germany have appeared two important introductions to the Old Testament. It is a sign of the times that both these books should be members of a series. Dr. Driver's work is the first volume of a projected "International Theological Library," edited by Drs. Salmond of Aberdeen and Briggs of New York; Dr. Cornill's belongs to a "Grundriss der Theologischen Wissenschaften," undertaken by a number of German scholars including, among others, Drs. Harnack, Jülicher, and Stade. If the series fulfil the promise of these two volumes, they will prove valuable contributions to the science of Theology.

I would emphasize the word 'Science,' because, as these two works clearly indicate, the literary material, at least, with which theology has to do, is being rapidly systematised, and made to yield very definite results. For a long time it has been easy for Apology to oppose its united traditionalism to the temporary disagreement of rational inquiry, and to say somewhat scornfully, "How these critics of the Bible differ!" But the appearance at once of these two books, one from the hand of a Canon of Oxford, the other of a professor at Königsberg, (expressing entire concurrence as to nearly all the main points of Old Testament criticism,) both supported by the approval and co-operation of a large and eminent editorial staff, marks the beginning of a new era in the study of the Bible. How close their agreement is will appear in the following pages, and I need only mention now that it extends to such points as the composite nature of the Pentateuch, the histories (Joshua—Kings), and the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Micah, and Zechariah; the exilic authorship of Isaiah xl.-lxvi.; the exilic or post-exilic dates of the priestly narrative in the Pentateuch, and of Joel; the un-Davidic and mainly post-exilic

character of the Psalms ; the un-Solomonic authorship of the Proverbs, the Song, and Ecclesiastes ; the post-Jeremian date of Lamentations ; a late date for Job ; the romantic and "tendenz" character of Ruth, Jonah, Esther, and Daniel ; and the "Greek" date of the Chronicler.

As we might expect, the critical acumen predominates in the German, the literary appreciation in the Englishman. England did not discover nor solve the greater problems of the Old Testament, nor has she yet in her scholarship the atmosphere favourable for the solution of the many minor problems that remain (such for instance as the relative work of the Iahvist and the Elohist in Joshua—Kings). It is the fault of his nationality if Dr. Driver cannot claim to be an original critic.

Nor has he entirely escaped the spirit of Apology. He indeed says, in brave words that ought to be printed in gold, "*We must weigh the alternatives, and ask which is the more probable*" (p. 20) ; but he feels it necessary to add in his preface, "It is not the case that critical conclusions, such as those expressed in the present volume, are in conflict either with the Christian creeds, or with the articles of the Christian faith." Presuming that Dr. Driver means the creeds and articles of the Church of England Prayer Book, I not only cannot follow him, but am tempted to ask whether if they had, in his opinion, "conflicted" with "the creeds and articles" of his Church, he would have arrived at these "conclusions" ? Partly on account of his traditions, mainly on account of the public for which he writes, the air of the apologist still clings to a fine scholar, and shows itself repeatedly in an anxiety to satisfy the fears of orthodoxy ; as when, for instance, he makes the astonishing confession respecting the Book of Jonah (p. 303), "no doubt the outlines of the narrative are historical, and Jonah's preaching was actually successful at Nineveh" ! Surely Dr. Driver is laughing up his sleeve.

But this tenderness towards orthodoxy will only add to the profound impression Dr. Driver's book must make in this and other English speaking countries. *It cannot be answered.* And it means inevitably the beginning of the end of what has for so long passed as Scriptural knowledge in our colleges and schools.

Moreover, not only is there a peculiar and novel pleasure in reading in pure and simple English what we have had hitherto to spell out of crabbed German, but Dr. Driver's "Introduction" has for us a special beauty of its own. Criticism has not made him love his Bible less, but more. His work is full of loving touches of true literary appreciation. He says, for example, of the Iahvist (Wellhausen's "*Bester Erzähler in der ganzen Bibel*"), that "he excels in the power of delineating life and character. With a few strokes he paints a

scene which, before he has finished, is impressed indelibly upon his reader's memory. In ease and grace his narratives are unsurpassed. His dialogues especially are remarkable for the delicacy and truthfulness with which character and emotions find expression in them : who can ever forget the pathos and supreme beauty of Judah's intercession ?" (p. 112). Comparing the style of Isaiah with that of the writer of Is. xl.-lxvi. he says, " Force is the predominant feature of Isaiah's oratory ; persuasion sits upon the lips of the prophet who here speaks : the music of his eloquence, as it rolls magnificently along, thrills and captivates the soul of its hearer." So, again, " if the most conspicuous characteristic of Isaiah's imagination be grandeur, that of the prophet to whom we are here listening is pathos " (p. 227). He says of Jeremiah : " The tragic pathos of Jeremiah's life is reflected in his book. And as the thoughts of an emotional spirit resent all artificial restraint, so Jeremiah's style is essentially artless. His prophecies have neither the artistic finish of those of Amos or Isaiah, nor the laboured completeness of Ezekiel's " (p. 256). He remarks justly of Ezekiel : " He has imagination, but not poetical talent " (p. 278) ; and of Nahum : " Nahum's poetry is fine. Of all the prophets he is the one who in dignity and force approaches most nearly to Isaiah : there is no trace of that prolixity of style which becomes soon afterwards a characteristic of the prophets of the Chaldean period " (p. 315).

Dr. Driver begins with a sketch of the growth of the Old Testament canon according to the Jews. He says : " The Jews possess no *tradition* worthy of real credence or regard, but only vague and uncertain reminiscences, intermingled often with idle speculations." The threefold division of the Scriptures into Law, Prophets, and " Hagiographa," is mentioned in the preface of " Jesus of Sirach," c. B.C. 130, and may have existed earlier. The letters in the opening of 2 Maccabees, purporting to be written B.C. 144, stating that Nehemiah " founded a library, and gathered together the things concerning the kings and prophets, and the writings of David and letters of kings," are both " spurious and untrustworthy." Similarly, " The Fourth Book of Ezra," c. A.D. 100, which states that Ezra rewrote the twenty-four books of the Bible, after they were burnt, by a divine material revelation, is " a legend unworthy of credit." The famous passage in the Talmud, Bâba Bâthra, 14*b*, as to the authorship of the different books, " is manifestly destitute of historical value." " The age and authorship," he says, " of the books of the Old Testament can be determined (so far as this is possible) only upon the basis of the internal evidence supplied by the books themselves, by methods such as those followed in the present volume : no external evidence worthy of credit exists."

Dr. Cornill treats this subject more concisely, with similar conclusions, at the end of his book. He approves of Buhl's opinion that the Scriptures, as a whole, were first used as canonical, in the technical sense of a sufficient and right rule of faith and conduct, by the Christian Fathers in the fourth century. The earliest appearance of anything like canonicity is in connection with the proclamation of Deuteronomy (2 Kings xxiii. 1—7). The Law, as a whole, was the first to become canonical (B.C. 621—444). The statement in 2 Maccabees ii. 13 has this amount of truth in it, that, after Ezra and Nehemiah, no book was taken up into the Scriptures which did not bear an earlier name. After the Law, the Prophets as a whole (B.C. 275—250), and then the Hagiographa as a whole (c. B.C. 100) gained canonicity, though single books were questioned. As late as A.D. 90 The Song, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Proverbs, Ruth, and even Ezekiel were considered by many doubtful. The names and orders of the different books varied greatly. The Book of Numbers was known by three several titles; Lamentations by two. The Talmud gave the number of books as twenty-four; Josephus and the Fathers reduced them to twenty-two, to bring them to the number of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet. Jerome, by splitting Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Ezra each into two, and separating Lamentations from Jeremiah, increased the number to twenty-seven, to include also the final letters, ך ם ן ף and ץ!

Dr. Cornill adds, what is a serious omission from Dr. Driver's book, an outline of the history of the text. Earlier, in § 4, he discusses the age of writing among the Hebrews, and says, "on the ground of documentary evidence in the papyrus of Anastasis III., that an active and regular official correspondence existed between Egypt and Palestine and Phœnicia in the time of Pharaoh Merenptah, the evermore probable Pharaoh of the Exodus, it would be rash to deny to Moses a knowledge of writing." David had his recorder and scribe (2 Sam. xx. 24 f.) and could write himself (2 Sam. xi. 14 f.). That reading and writing were general at a comparatively early date appears from Jud. viii. 14; and the cursive character of the inscription on the Mesha stone, erected about 125 years after David's death, implies an already advanced development of the art of writing. The Hebrew tradition, says Dr. Cornill, that the present "Quadrat" style is not the ancient Hebrew or Semitic writing is correct, but not that it was introduced by Ezra from Babylonia. Later, the Samaritan Pentateuch is still written in old Hebraic character. The "Quadrat," which is closely akin to the "Palmyrenic Egyptian-Aramaic cursive writing, was certainly, however, in use in the time of Jesus (Matt. v. 18) and can be traced as far back as the Persian period. The two styles are

mixed in the inscription of Arak el Emir of B.C. 176 ; and the writing is almost quite "Quadrat" on the so-called "Grave of Jacob" in Jerusalem, c. B.C. 100. The ancient Hebrew writing on the Shiloah and Mesha inscriptions is an old Semitic cursive style akin to the Phœnician, without stops or vowels. The "matres lectionis" partly supplied the defect of the latter, but were scantily used, becoming, however, more general as the language ceased to live, though still forbidden in the Talmud as untraditional. Jerome complains of the varied meanings of Hebrew words in a way which clearly proves that the present vowels were not in use in writing in his day. But in the oldest Hebrew MS., A.D. 916 the vowels are included, and must have come into use during the 7th, 8th, and 9th centuries of our era. The agreement among all existing MSS. of the Hebrew texts is so remarkable that they must have all come from a single copy or archetype. The wide divergences of the Septuagint and Targumim from the Hebrew, and the very close agreement with it on the other hand, of the later Greek translations of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, and Jerome's Latin translation, together point to the turn of the first and second centuries as the date of this archetype—a date confirmed by the history of the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, and by the old Arabian tradition that all codices of the Old Testament were copies of one saved from Bithter, where Rabbi Akiba was martyred. The consonant text therefore of this "received" or "Massoretic" Hebrew may have come from Hadrian's reign, and with it the *vocalisation* afterwards adopted in *writing*.

What, now, is the relation of this "received" or "Massoretic" text to the original Hebrew? In the centuries before Hadrian the text was not preserved with the same "sklavischen Treue" (would it had been!) as after, as a study of parallel passages in the Old Testament abundantly proves, but underwent modifications partly accidental, such as omissions, mis-readings, and errors necessarily consequent in a change of writing, and partly intentional on literary and theological grounds. Hence, for getting nearer the original text the value of comparison of the "Massoretic" with the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint versions, which are both independent of the "Massoretic"; the one, in ancient Hebrew writing, from the time of the adoption of the Pentateuch by the Samaritans in the fourth century B.C.; the other a Greek translation made in Alexandria. The former alone differs from the "Massoretic" in about 6,000 instances; whilst the wide divergence from it of the latter, in use among the early Christians, led to controversy between the churches and the synagogues, and to new translations in Greek of the "Massoretic" by Aquila (c. A.D. 133-166, very literal),

Theodotion (somewhat later, an attempt to bring the Septuagint into agreement with the "Massoretic"), and Symmachus (comparatively unknown in Origen's time : a free rendering). Also independent of the "Massoretic" are the Aramaic translations of the Hebrew, or Targumim, made for use in the synagogues as Hebrew became a dead tongue. Less valuable, and of Christian origin, but perhaps independent of the "Massoretic," is the Peshito, or old Syrian version. The old Latin, Coptic, Æthiopian, Gothic, and Armenian versions, of dates varying from the second to the fifth centuries, are translations of the Septuagint, whilst Jerome's Latin translation is of the "Massoretic" (A.D. 392-405).

This chapter is one of the most valuable in Dr. Cornill's book, and it is to be regretted that Dr. Driver has not found space to deal, even briefly, with the same important subject. Perhaps in a future edition, unless the subject is to receive special treatment in the *International Theological Library*, he might do so. It would strongly fortify his main critical position. It should, however, be remembered that Dr. Driver has ably discussed a great part of this subject in the introduction to his edition of Samuel. Dr. Cornill also gives, what are less inexcusably absent from Dr. Driver's book, sketches of the history of Old Testament criticism and of the history of the Pentateuchal analysis. Both are excellent, but hardly wanted in an introduction of this kind.

By the way, it is melancholy to note that in the long list of scholars mentioned in these historical surveys the names of only two Englishmen appear—Hobbes and Geddes ! But surely Colenso's work might have been recognised.

In their conclusions as to the Pentateuch our authors are practically at one, differing only in detail. They agree that it is composed of a Prophetic History Book, JE (compiled about B.C. 650, Cornill ; Driver less correctly, "approximately in the eighth century B.C."), of "Deuteronomy," D (written immediately before B.C. 621, Cornill ; Driver, less correctly, in the reign of Manasseh," therefore before B.C. 639), of a Book of Holiness, H (immediately after Ezekiel, Cornill ; less correctly, immediately prior to him, Driver), and of a Priestly History Book, P (c. B.C. 500, in Babylonia, Cornill ; Driver, less correctly, "in the period of the Babylonian captivity," therefore before B.C. 538). They also agree that the Prophetic History is made up of fragments of a Iahvistic narrative, J (of Judean authorship, before B.C. 750), and of an Elohist narrative, E (of Ephraimite authorship, c. B.C. 750) ; that Deuteronomy (Hilkiah's Law-Book, originally consisting of xii.—xxvi., Cornill ; of iv. 44—xxvi., Driver) and the Priestly History Book have undergone expansion in successive editions.

Both authors give careful analyses (Cornill's are more minute) of these component documents, and whilst they necessarily differ as to J and E, there is little or no difference between them as to the limits of D, H, and P. Dr. Driver supplements his analyses with carefully compiled lists of linguistic peculiarities, and treats admirably of the style and spirit of each narrative.

An important point, however, is not touched upon by either author. While they minutely distinguish the different narratives and determine their respective dates, they never address themselves to the question, "How came three such parallel writings as J and E and P to be written?" Such a fact is a unique phenomenon in literature, and demands explanation. The literary dependence of E on J, and of P on J + E + D is proved. The same thread runs through them: Creation, antediluvians, Flood, list of nations, patriarchs, Moses, Exodus, legislation, arrival in Canaan. Gen. xx.—xxi., E, is dependent on Gen. xxvi., J; xxvii. 21—24, E, on xxvii. 25—27; xxviii. 11^b, 12, E, on xxviii. 13, J; xxx. 8^b, E, on xxx. 8^a, J; xxx. 18^a on xxx. 16^b; Ex. i. 15, 16, E, on Ex. i. 22; Ex. iii. 9, E, on Ex. iii. 7, etc., etc. And "Adam," Gen. v. 1 ff., P, is dependent on "Ha-adam," ii. 4^b—iv., J; the corrupt earth, vi. 11, P, after the perfect work, i.—ii. 4^a; and the blameless pedigree, v., om. 29, implies a knowledge of Jahveh's displeasure in ii. 4^b—iv., J; the ten-membered list in v., P, is made up of the seven-membered list in iv. 16—24, and a second list, of which iv. 25 f., v. 29, are fragments, J; the 777 of v. 31 shows acquaintance with iv. 23; in xix. 29, P, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is expressly assumed; xxxiv. 8—10, P, is dependent on xxxiv. 11—12; Ex. vi. 2—5, P, on Ex. iii. 14—15, E; Num. xx. 2—13, P, on Ex. xvii. 1^b, 2^a, 5, 6, 7^b, E, etc., etc.

But the dependence is of such a kind that I think it is unmis-takeable that P was written to *supersede* J E, and E to *supersede* J. E and P differ from J in being written "uno tenore" throughout, each the work of a single hand; J is rather a compilation, a stringing together of very different elements, such as the Eden story on the one hand, and the story of Rebekah at the well on the other; such as the "Blessing of Jacob," wherein Judah is supreme, and the Joseph story, where Ephraim is supreme. E and P, moreover, are alike in their religious unity, each showing an interest in the use of the Divine names, and, more or less in E, very strongly and markedly in P, in religious institutions. I believe that E is a *re-writing* of J from a higher religious and slightly different political point of view, with the intent to supersede it, leaving out much that in J is crude and anthropomorphic. And that P was intended to supersede J E is obvious. In the Eden story, for instance—and we need not go further—child-bearing, industry, knowledge, civilisation are a *curse*;

in the story of the Six Days' Creation they are a *blessing*: "Elohim blessed man and said, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it" (i. 28). In the former it is robbery for man to strive to be like God (iii. 5, 22—24; xi. 6—9); whereas in the latter it is his natural duty and privilege: "Elohim created man in his own image, in the image of Elohim created he him" (i. 27). Such contrast, here and elsewhere, is not accidental, but intentional. E, therefore, was written by a prophet to supersede J, but failed to take its place in the affections of the people. P was written to supersede J E, by a priest, and more miserably failed. J E and J E D P are both the results of compromise.

Coming now to detail, I venture to join issue with Dr. Cornill in his treatment of the opening sections of the Jahvistic narrative. That the Eden story is independent of the story of the Flood is generally recognised. Also that it contains Hebrew elements, such as iv. 2^b—16^a (Cain and Abel), iv. 23, 24 (Lamech's sword-song), and ix. 25—27 (Noah's curse on Canaan). But to speak of it as an "echt hebräische Ueberlieferung" is surely incorrect. The Eden story is unmistakably of Chaldean origin. The sacred garden and divine abode, iii. 8; the trees of knowledge and immortality, the sacred river, the serpent or dragon, the cherubim, the flaming sword, the plain of Shinar and its brick, Babel and its tower—the centre of man's dispersion—are not Hebrew, but Chaldean elements. Conclusive is the *pessimistic* view of civilisation, without a parallel in early Hebrew thought: knowledge the root of all evil—(1) the loss of innocence, iii. 7; (2) the need of clothes, 7, 21; (3) family life and population, 16; (4) the necessity of labour, (a) agriculture 17 ff.; (b) habitation, iv. 16 f.; (c) cattle-breeding, 20; then (5) pastoral music, 21; (6) arts and crafts and weapons, 22; (7) brick-burning, architecture, great cities, and foreign tongues, xi. 1—9; (8) vine-planting, drunkenness, and the dishonour of parents, ix. 20—22. The peculiar phenomena of the opening sections of the Iahvistic narrative seem best explained by supposing that the Iahvistic author had before him Hebrew and Monotheistic versions of *two* ancient and independent polytheistic (the old polytheism still peeps through, iii. 1, 5, 22; vi. 2; xi. 7) myths—one of the first beginnings of humanity; the other of the world's destruction by a flood, which he largely re-wrote (cf. vi. 5—7 with iii. 22—24; vii. 22, with ii. 7; viii. 21, with iii. 8 ff., 22 f.; vi. 3; xi. 5 ff.; and note "rain," ii. 5; vii. 4; "face of the ground," ii. 6, 9; 19 ff.; iii. 17, 19; iv. 14; vi. 7; vii. 4, 23; viii. 8; "make," ii. 4^b, 18; vi. 6 f.), and wove into a single narrative by means of a Hebrew story of Cain and Abel, and a second and pious list of Noah's ancestors, iv. 25 f. . . . v. 29, . . . made up from the list in iv. 16^b—

24 ; and concluded with another Hebrew fragment, ix. 25—27. The discovery of the Chaldean original of the Eden story in the Assyrian tablets is probably only a question of time. See already the cylinder picture of Adam and Eve(?) in the British Museum. The hypothesis of different editions of J (J^1 J^2 J^3 etc.) seems to me to rest on very slender evidence. The Iahvistic narrative is *not*, in its very nature, the work of one hand, like E or P, but a compilation : a stringing together of old materials of very different date and authorship into a connected story. The Eden and Flood stories point to early contact with Chaldea, probably through the Canaanites. Lamech's sword-song and Noah's curse on Canaan also probably date from the Canaanite period. The patriarchal stories grew into their Iahvistic shape during the Ephraimitic supremacy between Jeroboam I. and Jeroboam II. (the evident pride of the Iahvistic narrator in his beautiful version of the Joseph story, by the bye, seems to me to prove conclusively that the Iahvist was an Ephraimite : against both Dr. Cornill and Dr. Driver). And the Blessing of Jacob (omitting the interpolation xlix. 24^b—26 : see my note in last number of Stade's *Zeitschrift für Alt. Test. Wissenschaft*, pp. 262 ff., where I have tried to show that these verses have been interpolated into the Judean poem from the Ephraimitic "Blessing of Moses," Deut. xxxiii., thereby destroying its *unity* : against Drs. Cornill and Driver, who adopt the old opinion that the "Blessing of Jacob" is a collection of different local verses) belongs to the reign of David. Such editorial matter as Gen. iv. 11—14 ; vi. 4 ; xii. 9 ; xiii. 1, 3, 4 ; xviii. 17, 22^b—33^a (and the concealing of Iahveh behind "three angels" in this and following chapter : see article in current number of Stade's *Zeitschr.*), xxii. 2, "Moriah," instead of "Amorite," 20—24 ; xxv. 1—6 ; xxvi. 2—5, etc., do not require an earlier hand than J E.

I venture to differ from both our authors respecting Genesis xv. and xxxviii. There seems to me to be no place for either of these chapters in J. Chap. xv. is certainly composite, but is not mad up of material from J or E. Rather it is an editorial, R^j, story, worked over by the priestly redactor R^b. Chap. xxxviii. is *not* Iahvistic. It differs from the Iahvist's work like calico from silk. It is akin in didactic purpose to the priestly narrative, but is excluded from it on linguistic grounds. It deals, like the story of Ruth (which contains a reference to this chapter in iv. 12), but in a very different spirit, with the Levirate law, as Jud. xix. (with which for its isolated and offensive character it may be compared) deals with the subject of concubinage ; and for this end Er and Onan are conveniently and summarily disposed of, 7, 10. As Jud. xix. is more or less based on Gen. xviii., xix., so Gen. xxxviii. is dependent on Gen. xxv. 24-26. Hence the

Iahvistic expressions ("Iahveh," 7, 10; "conceived and bare, and called his name," 3, 4, 5, cf. iv. 1, 25, xxix. 32ff). Cf. the priestly expressions in Gen. xiv. Tamar is a recollection of Absalom's sister, 2 Sam. xiii. Gen. xlv. 12, cf. Num. xxvi. 19-22, is editorial.

Dr. Cornill gives penetrating analyses of Gen. xxvii. (unanalysed by Dr. Driver), and xxxvii. (less carefully by Dr. Driver). Concerning the former, how can Dr. Cornill split the beautiful verses 27^b, 28? Cf. the conjunction in Iahvistic poetry of "Iahveh" and "Elohim" in Gen. ix. 25ff. With regard to the latter: surely 15-17^a are editorial to explain Joseph's presence both at Shechem, 13^a, 14^b, J, and Dothan, 17^b, E. Our authors are almost entirely at one in their analysis of the difficult chapter xxxiv. Dr. Driver, I think, is more correct in dividing it between J and P, than Dr. Cornill, who divides it between J and E: note, "which she bare unto Jacob," 1, cf. xvi. 15, 16, xxv. 12; "prince," 2, cf. xvii. 20; xxv. 16; "get possessions," 10, cf. xvii. 8 etc.; "every male," 15, 22, 24, 25, cf. xvii. 10, 12; "substance," 23, cf. xxxi. 18, etc.; cf. 8-10, 14-18 with xxiii. 7-9, 13-15; 20, 24 with xxiii. 10, 18; וְהָיָה, 10, cf. xxiii. 4, 9, 20; כָּהֵן, 10, cf. xxiii. 16. There is no evidence that Shechem in the P story did more than fall in love with Dinah; 13^b, 27^b are editorial.

Our authors differ somewhat in their analysis of Exodus ix. 13-35. Dr. Driver assigns ix. 13-21, 23^b-34, to J; ix. 22, 23^a, 24^a, 35 to E. Dr. Cornill, ix. 13-21, 23^b, 24 (in part) 25^a, 26, 27 (in part) 28-30, 33 to J; ix. 22-23^a, 24^b, 31, 32, 35 to E. I venture to restore J thus: "13^c And Iahveh said unto Mosheh, 'Rise up early in the morning, and stand before Pharaoh, and say unto him, Thus saith Iahveh, the God of the Hebrews, Let my people go, that they may serve me. 18 Behold, tomorrow about this time I will cause it to rain a very grievous hail, such as hath not been in Mizraim since the day it was founded even until now.' 23^b And Iahveh rained hail upon the land of Mizraim; 24 and the hail was very grievous, such as had not been in all the land of Mizraim since it became a nation. 26 Only in the land of Goshen, where were the sons of Israel, was there no hail. 27 And Pharaoh sent and called for Mosheh and said unto him, 28 'Intreat Iahveh; for there hath been enough hail; and I will let you go, and ye shall stay no longer.' 29 And Mosheh said unto him, 'As soon as I am gone out of the city, I will spread abroad my hands unto Iahveh.' 33 And Mosheh went out of the city from Pharaoh, and spread abroad his hands unto Iahveh; and the hail ceased. 34 But when Pharaoh saw that the hail was ceased, he made his heart stubborn, 35^b and did not let the sons of Israel go." And the following I would give to P: "22 And Iahveh said unto Mosheh, 'Stretch forth thine hand toward the heavens, that there may be hail in all the land of Mizraim, upon man and upon beast, and upon every herb of the field, throughout the

land of Mizraim.' ^{23a} And Mosheh stretched forth his rod towards the heavens ; and Iahveh sent thunders and hail, and fire ran down unto the earth. ²⁵ And the hail smote throughout all the land of Mizraim all that was in the field, both man and beast ; and the hail smote every herb of the field, and brake every tree of the field. ^{35ac} But the heart of Pharaoh was stiffened [and he hearkened not unto them], as Iahveh had spoken." The remainder is editorial. This latter narrative is P, not E. Cf. ix. 22, with 8 : "toward the heavens ;" and note that *Mosheh* acts similarly in 10. Observe, "upon man and upon beast," 22, 25, cf. 9, 10, viii. 17, 18 ; "throughout the land of Mizraim," 22, 25, cf. 9, viii. 16, 17 : "stiffened," ^{35a}, cf. 12.

Again. Dr. Driver assigns x. 13^b, 14^b—13, 28, 29 ; xi. 4—8 ; xii. 29, 30, to J : x. 12—13^a, 14^a, 20—27 ; xi. 1—3, 9, 10, to E. Dr. Cornill, x. 12—13^a, 14^a, 15^b, 20—27 ; xi. 1—3, to E : the rest of x., xi. 4—8 ; xii. 29, 30, to J : and xi. 9, 10, to P. I would restore J as follows : x. 13^b "And Iahveh brought an east wind upon the land all that day, and all the night ; and when it was morning, the east wind brought the locusts. ^{14b} And they rested in all the borders of Mizraim ; very grievous were they ; before them there were no such locusts as they, neither after them shall be such. ^{15a} And they covered the face of the whole land, so that the land was darkened. ¹⁶ And Pharaoh made haste to call for Mosheh, and he said, ^{17b} 'Entreat Iahveh, your God, that he may take away from me this death only.' ¹⁸ And he went out from Pharaoh and entreated Iahveh. ¹⁹ And Iahveh turned an exceeding strong west wind which took up the locusts, and drove them into the sea of Rushes ; there remained not one locust in all the border of Mizraim. [But Pharaoh made stubborn his heart], ^{20b} and did not let the sons of Israel go. xi. ¹ And Iahveh said unto Mosheh, 'Yet one plague more will I bring upon Pharaoh, and upon Mizraim ; afterwards he will let you go hence. [And] when he shall let you go, he shall surely thrust you out hence altogether. [Go in unto Pharaoh, and say unto him], ⁴ Thus saith Iahveh, About midnight will I go out into the midst of Mizraim ; ⁵ and all the firstborn in the land of Mizraim shall die, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even unto the firstborn of the slave-girl that is behind the mill ; and all the firstborn of cattle. ⁶ And there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Mizraim, such as there hath not been like it, nor shall be any more.' x. ²⁴ And Pharaoh [spake] unto Mosheh, and said, 'Go ye, serve Iahveh ; only let your flocks and your herds be stayed ; let your little ones also go with you.' ²⁵ And Mosheh said, 'Our cattle also shall go with us ; there shall not an hoof be left behind ; for thereof must we take to serve Iahveh our God.' xi. ^{3b} Now the man Mosheh was very great in the land of Mizraim in the eyes of Pharaoh's servants, and in the

eyes of the people ; and Pharaoh said unto him, 'Get thee from me, take heed to thyself, see my face no more ; for in the day thou seest my face thou shalt die.' ²⁹ And Mosheh said, 'Thou hast spoken well ; I will see thy face again no more.' ^{xi. 8b} And he went out from Pharaoh in hot anger. ²⁹ And it came to pass at midnight that Iahveh smote all the firstborn in the land of Mizraim."

And I would give to P: "^{x. 12a} And Iahveh said unto Mosheh, 'Stretch out thine hand over the land of Mizraim for the locusts, that they may come up upon the land of Mizraim, and eat every herb of the land, even all that the hail hath left.' ^{13a} And Mosheh stretched forth his rod over the land of Mizraim, ^{14a} and the locusts went up over all the land of Mizraim, ^{15b} and they did eat every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left; and there remained not any green thing, either tree or herb of the field through all the land of Mizraim. ^{20a} But Iahveh stiffened the heart of Pharaoh, . . . ²¹ And Iahveh said unto Mosheh, Stretch out thine hand towards the heavens, that there may be darkness over the land of Mizraim, even darkness which may be touched. ²³ And Mosheh stretched forth his hand towards the heavens; and there was a thick darkness in all the land of Mizraim for three days; ²³ they saw not one another, neither rose any from his place for three days; but all the sons of Israel had light in their dwellings. ²⁷ But Iahveh stiffened Pharaoh's heart . . . ^{xi. 9} And Iahveh said unto Mosheh, 'Pharaoh will not hearken unto you; that my wonders may be multiplied in the land of Mizraim. And Mosheh and Aharon did all these wonders before Pharaoh; but Iahveh stiffened Pharaoh's heart, and he did not let the sons of Israel go out of his land.' The remainder is editorial.

If the above passages are correctly given to P, there is no real evidence that the Elohist, except in iii. 15, and xx. 1, uses the name "Iahveh" in the Pentateuch. Distinct instances to the contrary are, iv. 20^b; xiii. 17—19; xix. 2^b, 19; xx. 18—21; xx. 1; xxiv. 13^b; xxi. 6, 13; xxii. 7, 8; xxxii. 16; xviii. 5, 12, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23. It is hardly reasonable that a writer who is so careful in the use of the divine name, "Elohim," before iii. 15, should use it after that *indiscriminately* with "Iahveh." I would, therefore, assign xv. 20 (om. "the sister of Aharon"), 24^a; xvii. 3, 2^b, 7^{ac} (place named "Massah," "tempting," 2^b, 7^{ac}, not "Meribah," "striving," 2^a, 7^b), and Num. x. 29 (om. "Chobab, the son of ") 30, 33, 35, 36, 34 (the parallel to Ex. xviii.), and other passages often assigned to E, to J. Dr. Cornill is surely right in giving "das Bundesbuch," Ex. xxi.—xxiv. (which, I think, originally consisted of only xxi. 1—13^a . . . 15 . . . 17, 16, 18—23^a . . . 26—xxii. 16, 18; xxiv. 18^b: notice the formula, "If a man . . . then . . .", which restore in xxi. 2, and xxii. 18; and read "Elohim" in

xxii. 10, with LXX. ; insert xxiv. 12, 13^a, 14, 13^b, between xx. 17^a and xxi. 1, reading "Elohim" in xxiv. 12) to E ; but is he correct in adopting Kuenen's suggestion that it originally was given to Moses, not at Mount Sinai, but at the point of entrance into Canaan, like Deuteronomy, and, therefore, stood later in the narrative ? One fact seems fatal to this otherwise plausible conjecture ; namely, that the scene of xviii., which must have *followed* the "Bundesbuch" (16, "I make them know the statutes of Elohim, and his laws" ; 20, "Thou shalt teach them the statutes and the laws") is laid still in the wilderness. xviii. 1^b ("how that Iahveh had brought Israel out of Mizraïim"), 2^b ("after he had sent her away"), 8—11 is editorial.

Driver contributes nothing to the analysis of the difficult chaps. Num. xxii. 2—xxiv., but Cornill assigns xxii. 3^a, 4, 5 (in pt.), 11 (in pt.), 22—34, 39, xxiv. (in the main) to J. I would suggest that xxii. 3^a, 4 (om. "elders of Midian"), 5 (ex. "to Pethor, which is by the River," possibly a fragment of E ; read "Ammon" with LXX. ; "cover the eye of the land," cf. Ex. x. 5, 15 J), 6, 7 (om. "and the elders of Midian"), 11 (cf. 5), 17 (om. "for"), 18 (the answer to 11, 17), 22 (directly contradicts 20), 23—27^a, 31—34 (Balaam returns home), 37 (Balak goes in person after him, cf. 17), 39 (continues 37), xxiv. 2 (continues xxii. 39), 5—7, 8^b, 10 (om. "these three times"), 11 (cf. xxii. 17, 37), 12, 13 (cf. xxii. 18), 14, 17—19 ; and xxii. 2, 3^b, 8 ("princes" not "elders," 7 ; read "Elohim"), 9 (cf. Gen. xx. 3, xxxi. 24, E), 10, 12 (answer to 10), 13 ("princes ;" read "Elohim" with LXX.), 14—16 ("princes"), 19 (cf. 8), 20, 21 (cf. Gen. xxii. 3), 36, 38, 41, xxiii. 1—3 (read "Elohim" with LXX.), 4, 5 (read "Elohim" with LXX.), 6—10, 11, 12 (read "Elohim" with LXX.), 13—17 ("princes," read "Elohim" with the LXX.), 18, 19, 20 ("men," cf. 10), 21, 22 (*God*, not *David*, the king in Israel, cf. xxiv. 17, ff.), 24, 25, 26 (read "Elohim" with the LXX.), make two parallel Balaam stories from J and E respectively. Editorial, therefore, are 28—30 (I cannot believe the Jahvist wrote anything so silly : the mythological serpent in Gen. iii. is no parallel), 35, 40 ("sent" fits ill with 36 or 37), xxiii. 23 (interrupts 22, 24), 27—xxiv. 1, 3, 4 ("El Shaddai" very suspicious), 8^a (cf. xxiii. 22), 9^a (cf. Gen. xlix. 9), 9^b (cf. Gen. xxvii. 29), 15, 16 (cf. 3, 4), 20—24, and probably the "angel" in xxii. 22—27, 31—34. Cornill surely rightly follows Budde in tracing J and E in the historical books, Judges—Kings ; but how far Budde's analysis is trustworthy is another matter. The question is too large to deal with here, but that the Prophetic sources of the Hexateuch are also among the sources of these histories is not only *à priori* most probable, but incontestably proved by such passages, among many others, as Jud. vi. 36—40 (E : note "Elohim ;" "rose up early in the morning"), vii. 13—15^a (E : "Elo-

him ;" "the dream" and its interpretation, cf. Gen. xxxvii. 5, 9 ; xl. 5 ff. ; xli.), 1 Sam. iii. 4—10 (E : "Samuel ... Here am I," cf. Gen. xxii. 7, 11 ; xxvii. 1^b, xxxvii. 13, xli. 2 f. ; Ex. iii. 4) ; 1 Sam. xxv. (J : "find favour in the eyes of," 8 ; with 2 cf. Gen. xiii. 2, 5 ; with 18 cf. Gen. xliii. 11 ; with 23 cf. xxiv. 64 ; with 32 cf. Gen. xxiv. 27 ; with 35 cf. Gen. iv. 7, xxxii. 20 ; and note the fine descriptive power) ; 2 Sam. xiii. (J : with 12 cf. Gen. xxxiv. 2^b, 7^b ; with 18 cf. Gen. xxxvii. 3, 23, 32 ; with 22 cf. Gen. xxiv. 50 ; with 36 cf. Gen. xxvii. 38, l. 11). No treatment of these books can be adequate that disregards such phenomena, and it is to be regretted that Driver should have made no attempt to deal with them. He gives, however, useful lists of peculiar expressions. I cannot, by the by, agree with either of our authors in treating Jud. xix. as containing an ancient narrative. It is only "old in style and representation" by imitation of Gen. xix., and like Gen. xxxviii. is of late and post-exilian authorship.

Coming now to the prophets, the following table will show how Driver and Cornill converge in their analysis of "Isaiah":—

Chapters.	DRIVER.	CORNILL.
i.	Reign of Jotham (B.C. 735), or Hezekiah (701)	i. 1, editorial ; 2, 3, Jotham ; 4-9, end of Syro-Ephraimite war (734) ; 10-17, Hezekiah (701) ; 18-32, end of Syro-Ephraimite war (734).
ii.—v.	Beginning of the reign of Ahaz.	ii. 1, editorial ; 2-4, Deutero-Isaianic ; 5—v. 24, beginning of the reign of Ahaz ; 25, editorial ; 26-30, Ahaz ; should follow ix. 8-21.
vi.	Uzziah (740 ?)	Uzziah (735 ?).
vii. 1—ix. 7.	Syro-Ephraimite war	Syro-Ephraimite war.
ix. 8—x. 4	Syro-Ephraimite war	ix. 8-21, Ahaz ; Syro-Ephraimite war : ix. 9, 10, the siege of Samaria (722) ; x. 1-4 ^a , Ahaz ; Syro-Ephraimite war : should follow v. 1-24 ; 4 ^b , editorial.
x. 5—xii. 6	Hezekiah and Sennacherib (701).	x. 5-34, Sargon (722-710) ; xi. 1-9, Ahaz, in the midst of the Syro-Ephraimite war, cf. vii. 1-ix. 6 ; xi. 10-xii. 6, Deutero-Isaianic.
xiii. 1—xiv. 23	Exilian, shortly before 549.	xiii. 1, editorial ; xiii. 2—xiv. 23, exilian, c. 538.
xiv. 24-27	Hezekiah and Sennacherib (701).	Sennacherib ? or Sargon ? cf. x. 5-34.
28-32	Shortly after Sargon's death, in 705.	Shortly after Sargon's accession, 722.
xv.—xvi. 12	Pre-Isaianic ; Uzziah's reign ; defeat of Moab by Jeroboam II.	Pre - Isaianic ; Uzziah's reign ; defeat of Moab by Jeroboam II.

Chapters.	DRIVER.	CORNILL.
xv.—xvi. 13, 14.	Epilogue by Isaiah, shortly before 711.	Epilogue by Isaiah, in 711.
xvii. 1-11 . . .	Immediately before the outbreak of the Syro-Ephraimite war.	Immediately after the outbreak of the Syro-Ephraimite war.
12-14 . . .	Sennacherib's invasion, 701.	Siege of Samaria, 722.
xviii.	Sennacherib's invasion, 701.	Sennacherib's reign, before 704.
xix.	Battle of Raphia, 720? .	After Sennacherib's retreat, 701.
xx.	711	711.
xxi. 1-10 . . .	710?	Deutero-Isaianic, c. 549.
11-12 . . .	720 or 711?	{ Older prophecies used by Isaiah, c. 720-711; but possibly by a later editor.
13-17 . . .	720 or 711?	
xxii. 1-14 . . .	711 or 701?	701, after Sennacherib's retreat.
15-25. . .	Before 701	Before 701.
xxiii.	701?	Exilian, c. 580.
xxiv.—xxvii. .	"Early post-exilic period."	c. 330, Greek period.
xxviii.—xxxiii. .	xxviii., prior to 722; xxix.—xxxii., 702; xxxiii., 701.	xxviii.—xxxii. 701; xxxii.—xxxiii., post exilian.
xxxiv.—xxxv. .	Close of the exile . . .	Close of the exile, perhaps by the author of xiii.—xiv. 23.
xxxvi.—xxxix. .	From 2 Kings; xxxvii. 22-32; Isaiah, 701.	From 2 Kings; xxxvii. 6f? 22-32, Isaiah, 701; xxxix. 5-7, before 704.
xl.—lxvi. . . .	Exilian, the work of an author between the years 549—538.	xl.—xlvi., excepting xlii. 1-7, exilian, 546-538; xlix.—lxii., post-exilian, by the same author as xl.—xlvi., excepting lvi. 9—lvii. 13, and perhaps lix. 3-16 ^a ; lxiii.—lxvi., post-exilian, by a different author.

Driver's conclusions simply represent a less-developed stage of criticism than Cornill's.

Cornill's careful analysis of "Jeremiah" may be summarised thus:—

The "Urrolle" of the fifth year of Jehoiakim, B.C. 604: i., ii., iii. 1—5, 19—iv. 2, iv. 2—v. 19, 23—vi. 30, vii.—viii. 9, 13—ix., x. 17—xi. 6, 9—xii. 6, xiv.? xv.? 1—10, 15—21, xviii.? xxv. 1—3, 8—11, 13^a, 15—29, xlv. 1—26, xlvii., xlviii.? xlix. 1—33.

Later prophecies, before the death of Jehoiakim, B.C. 597: xii. 7—17, xvi. (om. 14, 15), xvii. 1—4? 5—13? 14—18, and in the biographical passages xix. 1—xx. 6, xxvi., xxxv., xxxvi., xlv.

Later prophecies, in the reign of Jehoiakim, B.C. 597: xiii.

Later prophecies, in the reign of Zedekiah, before B.C. 586 : xx 7—18, xxi. 11—xxiii., xxiv., xxix., xxxii. (om. 17—23), xxxiii. 4—13, xlix. 34—39.

Later prophecies, in the reign of Zedekiah, after the destruction of Jerusalem : xxx. 1—9, 12—14, 16—21, xxxi. 1—34.

Later prophecies, in the reign of Zedekiah, in the biographical passages, xxi. 1—10, xxvii., xxviii., xxxiv., xxxvii.—xliv. 30.

The biographer of Jeremiah and compiler of his writings, in the second half of the exile : xix.—xxi., xxvi.—xxix., xxxiv.—xlv., l. 59—64.

Later additions : iii. 6—18, v. 20—22, viii. 10—12 (repeats vi. 12—15), x. 1—16, xi. 7, 8, xv. 11—14, xvi. 14, 15 (from xxiii. 7 f.), xvii. 19—27 (cf. xxxiii. 14—26, Neh. xiii. 15—22), xxv. 4—7, 12, 13^b, 14, 30—38, xxix. 16—20, xxx. 10 f. (repeated in xlvi. 27 f.), 15, 22, 23 f. (from xxiii. 19 f.), xxxi. 35—37, xxxii. 17—23, xxxiii. 1—3, 14—26 (16 f. from xxiii. 5 f.), xxxix. 9—13, xl. 1—6, xlvi. 27 f., l.—li. 58, lii. (from 2 Kings).

Driver's treatment is not so complete ; but again here and in the case of the "Second Isaiah" and "Ezekiel" he adds valuable tables of characteristic expressions.

Our authors agree as to the unity and genuineness of the Book of Ezekiel. "If anywhere," says Cornill, "a book in the Old Testament bears the mark of authenticity on its forehead, and is preserved in the condition in which it left its author's hand, that book is 'Ezekiel.'"

Of the minor prophets, Driver might have referred to the objections to Hosea ii. 1—3, and to Amos ii. 4 f., iv. 13, v. 8 f., ix. 56 in spite of Kuenen. Driver decides conclusively, against Credner, for the post-exilic date of "Joel"; whilst Cornill dates the book about B.C. 400 and later rather than earlier. He says, "In the book of Joel we have a written compendium of the late Jewish eschatology, at the period when the newer prophecy was passing into Apocalypse." For "Jonah" Driver says "a date in the fifth century B.C. will probably not be far wide of the mark"; Cornill: "towards the end of the Persian, perhaps rather in the Greek period." The following gives our authors' conclusions respectively concerning the book of Micah.

Chapters.	DRIVER.	CORNILL.
i., ii. 1-11, iii. .	Before B.C. 722.	Before B.C. 722.
ii. 12-13. . . .	Micah's, but misplaced.	Deutero-Isaianic.
iv., v.	Micah's, but added at different times to i.—iii. Written about 701. iv. 10 ('and shalt come even unto Babylon') is an interpolation. Possibly iv. 11-13 also.	iv. 1-4, 11—v. 4, 7-14, Deutero-Isaianic; iv. 5-10, v. 5, 6, also an interpolation

Chapters.	DRIVER.	CORNILL.
vi. 1—vii. 6 . .	Reign of Manasseh; probably not Micah's.	Reign of Manasseh, not Micah's.
vii. 7-20 . . .	Possibly by author of vi. 1-vii. 6, and exilian.	Deutero-Isaianic; ii. 12, 13, iv. 5-10, v. 5, 6, vii. 7-20, probably by the same hand.

Cornill follows Hitzig in assigning to¹ Habakkuk i.—ii. 8; and ii. 9—20 and iii. to later writers. Driver certainly exaggerates when he ranks Habakkuk iii. “for sublimity of poetic conception and splendour of diction with the finest (Jud. v.) which Hebrew poetry has produced;” but Cornill is wrong in speaking of the poem as an “ungebührlich überschätster Psalm,” which “bietet reine Rhetorik”; vv. 17, 18 at least are not “reine Rhetorik.” Driver and Cornill agree that “Zephaniah” dates from before the reformation of Josiah and soon after the Scythian invasion, *i. e.*, c. 630: but the latter suspects passages in ii., and especially iii. 14—20, as Deutero-Isaianic. Driver is inclined to separate Zechariah ix.—xiv., and to assign ix.—xi., xii. 7—9 to a pre-exilian, the remainder to a post-exilian date; but Cornill follows Stade in maintaining the unity of the whole section and giving it to an author who moved among the ideas of the later Jewish Apocalypse and wrote during the struggles of the “Diadochi,” *i. e.*, c. B.C. 280.

Driver introduces his chapter on the Psalms with a sketch of Hebrew poetry, which is an omission from Cornill's book. To his list of purely secular songs, p. 339, Driver, for reasons given above, might have added the poem in Gen. xlix. And Jud. v. is as secular as Num. xxi. 27—30. To the Psalms “incorrectly conjoined,” p. 345, Driver might have added Ps. xxiii.: vv. 5, 6 are unconnected with vv. 1—4; not only do 1—4 make a complete Psalm in themselves, but vv. 5, 6 entirely change and even *reverse* the imagery: “the table,” “the oil,” “the cup,” “the Temple,” have nothing to do with the shepherd life of 1—4, and the divine “goodness and mercy” that “*follow*,” 6, are not the care and guidance that “*lead*,” 1—4. Ps. xxiii. 1—4, then, might be added to Ewald's list of Psalms which on æsthetic grounds could have been David's. Respecting these, Driver's conclusion seems eminently just: “If Deborah, long before David's time had ‘sung unto Jahveh’ (Jud. v. 3), there can be no *à priori* reason why David should not have done the same; and in 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, the expression ‘the sweet singer of Israel’ implies that David was the author of religious songs. On the whole, a *non liquet* must be our verdict: it is possible that Ewald's list is too large, but it is not clear that none of the Psalms contained in it are of David's composition.” At the same time, as Cornill finely says, “David the Psalmist is a post-

exilian creation, a link in the chain of development of Israel's old history into a 'Kirchengeschichte,' after that, through the institutions of Deuteronomy and the natural sequence of events, Israel had passed from a State into a Church, and from a nation into a community. The David who through Messianic prophecy was set in the middle point of religious interest, of whom it was known that he had made poems and taken active part in the cultus, could only have been a religious poet, and all religious 'Lyrik' was assigned to him, as the whole of proverbial wisdom to his son, Solomon."

Cornill insists rightly on the relationship of "Proverbs" to the Apocrypha. The "Konigssprüche" in Proverbs, which used to be advanced as the surest proof of a pre-exilian origin, have their counterpart in "Jesus of Sirach," vii. 4-6; viii. 1-3; x. 1-5. Driver apparently accepts the view that Prov. i.-ix. were written as an introduction to the older collection x.-xxii. 16, shortly before the "Exile"; but as Cornill correctly observes the "Wisdom" of these chapters cannot be separated by centuries from the apocryphal "Wisdom." He quotes Reuss with approval that in the personification of "Wisdom" in Prov. viii., "Jewish metaphysics and the philosophy of Alexandria, speak not indeed a last but certainly a first word." "The Hebrew 'Wisdom,'" he says, "affords us a parallel phenomenon to the philosophy of Greece; with this difference, that the 'Hebrew' 'wisdom' is always and everywhere ethically and religiously conceived, Prov. ii. 5-10; iii. 13-26. It is not philosophic but theologic, or if you prefer, theosophic speculation."

The crown of this Hebrew "wisdom-writing," later than Prov. i.-ix. (xv. 7 is directly dependent on Prov. viii. 25, and unintelligible without it), and belonging to the latest period of Hebrew literature (against Driver, who decides for the latter half of the exile) is, according to Cornill, the Book of Job. Into his spirited treatment of the poem it is impossible to enter here; but it is most interesting to find the German critic, though on internal and psychological grounds, *defending* the "Elihu" speeches, which Driver, with the great majority of scholars, rejects. His defence, I think, can only deepen the conviction that "Job" is yet one of the unsolved problems of the Old Testament.

Another still unanswered riddle is the "Song of Songs." Cornill contents himself with Reuss' division of the poem into sixteen love idylls. Driver gives the analysis of Delitzsch and Ewald as representing the traditional and the modern view respectively, according as Solomon or a shepherd is taken as the hero of the piece. He accepts the latter, and therefore dismisses the opinion that Solomon was the author, but inclines to a north Israelite origin and an early pre-

exilian date. Cornill, however, is surely more correct in assigning it, on linguistic grounds, at the earliest, to the Persian period: "If," he says, "of any book in the Bible it may be said 'Thy speech bewrayeth thee,' that book is the 'Song of Songs.'" Graetz, whose arguments Driver takes too little into account, is probably right in regarding the Song as contemporary with Greek poetry. Mr. Russell Martineau, in a recent paper before the Society of Historical Theology, Oxford, brings out some interesting parallels between it and verses of Bion and Moschus.

To a Greek date also must be assigned that other "unsolved problem," the book of "Ecclesiastes." "The question whether Koheleth shows immediate acquaintance with and direct dependence on Greek philosophy, is an open one: but this much is certain, that only through the influence at least of Hellenism could the Jewish mind produce such a work." So Cornill, with which Driver agrees.

As to the remaining books of the Old Testament, Lamentations, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, there is little or no difference of opinion between our authors. It only remains to say a word of praise for Dr. Cornill's excellent chronological register of the literature at the close of his volume, and to express a hope that Dr. Driver will some day add to his book an index of at least principal passages.

EDGAR INNES FRIPP.

Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung der Hebräischen Accente. I. Theil. Von ADOLPH BÜCHLER. (Wien, 1891.)

THE Talmud recommends appropriate intonation (*neimah*) for the reading of the Bible (Babyl. Talm. Megillah, 32a), but does not give any rules as to the way of intonation; nor is there any mention of musical symbols or notes. The term *taamim* ("accents") occurs several times in the Talmud, but it is doubtful whether it refers to "written symbols," or to "melody," or "accentuation" in general. The plural form of the word (*taamim*) suggests the existence of a number of accents, and great stress seems to have been laid on preserving the exact force of each of the various accents. When it was found that, contrary to the ancient custom, teachers received payment for instruction in the Law, these were excused on the plea that it was only the teaching of the accurate accentuation that was paid for. In a discussion whether *parim* in Exodus xxiv. 5 referred only to *sh'lamim*, or also to *oloth*, the question arose as to the object of the discussion, since it was indifferent to the *halachah* which of the two interpretations was adopted. The answer was that it was